

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 664

95

SO 000 183

TITLE Inventory of Training Centers; Ad Hoc National Advisory Committee on Training Complexes. Final Report.

INSTITUTION Clark Univ., Worcester, Mass.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE Jun 70

NOTE 64p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.50 HC-\$3.30

DESCRIPTORS *Educational Programs, Industrial Training, *Models, *National Surveys, *Program Descriptions, Protocol Materials, Skill Centers, Teacher Education, Training Laboratories

IDENTIFIERS *United States

ABSTRACT

This is a report of a selective survey of training activities in the United States. Selection centered on the representative activities of a variety of institutions which served different audiences, had different goals, and different sources of funding. Most of the inventories were conducted in person by a committee member. The 14 reports are restructured into narrative form (inventory form is appended). The training centers inventoried are: Sears Roebuck Territorial Training Center; Institute for Behavioral Research, Inc.; Washington School Project (Ill.); Multi-Instructional Teacher Preparation Agency (Vt.); National Training Laboratory for Applied Behavioral Science; Metro-Atlanta Student Teaching Model; Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program; Smoky Mountain Cultural Arts Development Assoc.; The EPD Consortium E (Texas); Far West Lab for Educational Research and Development; Milwaukee Project (Early Childhood Training); CUNY Doctoral Program in Educational Administration; The Teachers, Inc.; The University of Chicago Teacher Training Project. Five models are extracted from the data, and micro-studies are planned to examine different aspects of these models. SO 000 184 is a related document. (DJB)

ED0 42664

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

FINAL REPORT

INVENTORY OF TRAINING CENTERS

AD HOC NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRAINING COMPLEXES

JUNE, 1970

TRAINING COMPLEX PROJECT ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER

CLARK UNIVERSITY

WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS

SØ 000 183

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

SEARS ROEBUCK TERRITORIAL TRAINING CENTER.....	1
INSTITUTE FOR BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH, INC.	3
WASHINGTON SCHOOL PROJECT (ILLINOIS).....	8
MULTI-INSTRUCTIONAL TEACHER PREPARATION AGENCY (VERMONT).....	10
NATIONAL TRAINING LABORATORY FOR APPLIED BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE....	13
METRO-ATLANTA STUDENT TEACHING MODEL.....	17
COOPERATIVE URBAN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM.....	20
SMOKY MOUNTAIN CULTURAL ARTS DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION.....	27
THE EPD CONSORTIUM E (TEXAS).....	31
FAR WEST LABORATORY FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT...	35
MILWAUKEE PROJECT (EARLY CHILDHOOD TRAINING).....	37
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK DOCTORAL PROGRAM IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION.....	39
THE TEACHERS, INC.	42
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO TEACHER TRAINING PROJECT.....	47

APPENDICES :

MEMBERSHIP ROSTER

SUMMARY CHART

TRAINING COMPLEX INVENTORY FORM

INTRODUCTION

During the months of March and April, 1970, members of the National Advisory Committee on Training Complexes investigated a variety of training centers. These inventories attempted to:

1. ascertain whether the concept of a "training complex" as defined by the Committee was already in existence.
2. locate those components of training centers which might be worthwhile parts of future training complex models.
3. give the Committee a clearer picture of the variety and broad outlines of training activities in the United States.

This compilation of inventories which follows is not a comprehensive report of all training activities presently underway. The selection process centered on achieving representative activities throughout the nation from a variety of institutions which served different audiences, had different goals and different sources of funding.

Mitchell Lichtenberg (Clark) and Mortimer Kreuter (SUNY, Stony Brook, N. Y.) created the inventory form. Whenever possible, members of the Committee conducted the inventories in person. In cases where Committee members were unable to meet with respondents, individuals known to be close to the respondent institution were chosen for the task.

The results of the inventories have shown great diversity in developing training programs. Virtually every inventory turned up some facet of training that might be profitably integrated into a training complex.

During the March meeting, the Committee extracted a number of tentative models using data from the inventories. These models were:

1. Teaching Skill--Protocol Materials--Instructional Model (centers on behavioral and instructional skills)
2. Social-Political--Social System Model (centers on sensitivity to the community, its needs, etc.)

3. Interpersonal Model (centers on sensitivity training, verbalization of needs, personal relationships)
4. Teacher Designed--Operated--Oriented Model (centers on the teacher--his particular needs, desires, abilities)
5. Industrial Training Model (centers on tasks, action oriented for narrowly construed problems, uses short training sessions, treats immediate crises with ad hoc trainers, serves throughout year)

On the basis of the information gathered from the inventories and from discussion at its May meeting, the Committee considered for recommendation five micro-pilot studies to be established to investigate aspects of these models during the next academic year (1970-71). Information gained from these micro-pilot studies will provide essential data regarding guidelines and costs for future training complexes. Thus, the micro-pilot results will establish a set of "yardsticks" by which future proposals may be measured. Each micro-pilot study will attempt to derive knowledge about the following set of common variables:

1. "Neutral Ground" vs. Traditional University Base
2. In-Service vs. Pre-Service vs. a Combination of Trainees
3. Real Setting vs. Simulation
4. Attitude Change
5. Points of Entry in the Training Period
6. Institutional Settings for Training Process
7. Time (length, frequency, proportion)
8. Cost (direct and indirect)
9. Degree of Community Participation
10. Characteristics of Trainees
11. Deployment of Personnel to Replace Regular Teaching Personnel
12. Role of Para-professional
13. Characteristics of Target Population (Pupils).

Various Committee members are now preparing detailed proposals for the micro-pilot studies. Decisions regarding the funding of these proposals will be made subsequent to the Committee's meeting in June, 1970.

* * * * *

This report restructures the information given in the inventory forms. Inventory questions have been deleted and some sentences have been modified for consistency. Generally, the report follows the sequence of questions on the form. Bibliographies, where noted, have been included. References to particular exhibits have been replaced by an appended list of training center materials, on file at the Training Complex Project Office at Clark University. These materials are available for inspection by writing to: Director, Training Complex Project, Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts 0161

SEARS ROEBUCK TERRITORIAL TRAINING CENTER

R. J. Newton

Sears, Roebuck & Co. maintains a training center restricted to company employees. There are no outside contractual arrangements, and the Center functions primarily as a convenience to company units in the Northeastern United States. Company units use the Center facilities on a voluntary basis. Enrollment runs approximately 2,700 trainees annually.

Executive management decided that an ever tightening labor force coupled with an ever increasing change in appliance technologies made it imperative for the company to provide training to its people if customer satisfaction was to be assured. Executive management initiated the thought, the board of directors approved the funding, and the technical training directors in each of its five major territories did the initial planning.

The formal objectives of the training program were to provide:

Basic training for the inexperienced
Cross training for the experienced
Advanced training for the specialists

In all cases, the prime objective is to enable the individual to perform satisfactorily in his assigned task.

Training emphasized consists of:

1. Appliance Service
2. Electronics
3. Automotive

Training materials are developed using:

1. Technical information developed by source manufacturers and center instructors.
2. Instructional tactics, procedures and media developed by center instructors.

Trainers are picked from the territorial field engineering staff or from our field service supervisors. Selection is made on their technical background, ability to communicate, deportment and sincere desire to be of assistance to others lacking in knowledge.

They are trained by periodic visits to various manufacturers who provide their training and engineering staffs to impart information on current and future technological changes. Also, audio/visual suppliers provide their instructors periodically to introduce new methods of communication.

Trainer evaluation is done by:

1. Comparison of the results of pre-training test with the results of course tests.
2. Students ability to perform in the lab sessions.
3. General comments received from students.

Trainees are company service employees numbering some 4,000 men in the Northeast, all of which are eligible to be enrolled in any of some 30 courses which Sears conducts.

Evaluation is done on a local level by local unit management.

Training periods are from one to two weeks in duration with time lapses of two to three months between sessions during which time the trainee returns to his service unit and puts to practice those things he has been trained to do during this time. The trainee is encouraged to participate in related correspondence courses which are provided at no charge. At present, there are approximately 5,600 active students involved in home study courses.

Training is done at a centrally located center servicing a 13-state area.

The most adequate training experiences are those provided in the labs and work areas. The least adequate are those involving theory lectures. Training programs generally provide a significant boost in employee morale.

The training program costs \$170,000 annually. This does not include student salaries and travel/living expenses.

PERSONAL REACTION:

I feel this program is not unique. It can be exported and duplicated in its entirety.

PAUL W. DEVORE
(WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY)

INSTITUTE FOR BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH, INC.

Harold L. Cohen

The Institute is run by the Director and two standing committees; one is the coordinators committee; the other is the planning committee. The planning committee is made up of the heads of research program centers, such as the Adult Learning Center, etc. We have a special committee which is concerned with safeguarding the rights and welfare of human subjects of research investigations. The Institute occupies 15,000 sq. ft. of space on site. Forty-five hundred feet are absorbed by the Educational Facility, an auditorium, two classrooms, the library, the communications resource center, etc.

Grants and contracts for basic and applied research; fixed price arrangements for training teachers; training of personnel--graduate and post-graduate. Through arrangements with department chairmen our staff has sat on dissertation committees at the University of Maryland, Arizona State University, and Southern Illinois University.

Training at the Institute for Behavioral Research has been going on since its inception. In the early years, it was done on an informal basis between psychology departments at the University of Maryland, Arizona State University, and the Department of Neuropsychiatry, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, and the Washington School of Psychiatry. The major thrust was the training of experimental psychologists, with emphasis on operant psychology. Research with animals was carried on, with a small part of the research dealing with retarded children and programmed instruction development. About five years ago, the Institute hired Mr. Harold L. Cohen as its Educational Director, and a major effort in the development of programs for adolescent education was initiated. Early curriculum development was in English and mathematics but quickly broadened to include junior and senior high school curricula. The Institute developed programmed instructional procedures for the teaching of Thai and Vietnamese, as well as a German language program.

Grants were received from the Office of Education to develop in-service training for professionals and paraprofessionals involved in the re-education of autistic children and for the initiation of parent training courses for their families. It was, at this time, that the Institute started a training program for psychiatrists and two psychiatrists received training from Doctors Israel Goldiamond and C. B. Ferster in the use of operant techniques.

The character of the staff started to change, due to the growth of interest in the development of academic programs and the training of teachers needed to institute and maintain such programs in the

films in the areas of operant psychology, law, drugs and general behavior modification instructional materials, plus its own collection of programs that have been used and modified during the last five years. Well over 200 programs in various forms are available at the Institute.

The trainers are basically from the basic research and operational research staff of the Institute. There are few exceptions, such as Dr. Harold Weiner, Behavioral & Clinical Studies Research Center, St. Elizabeth's Hospital, Washington, D. C., and Dr. Solomon S. Steiner, Department of Psychology, City College of New York; and other one-day speakers that are brought in from nearby educational institutions, as well as institutions as far away as Kansas. The Executive Director of the Institute regards the training of school personnel as an important part of the Institution because it (a) brings in a source of contractual funding, and (b) demonstrates to the community the effective use of the research in design and operant psychology. Every staff member is expected to contribute part of his time away from his research and he is so scheduled by the Executive Director.

The graduate and post-graduate trainees are not sought. The Institute receives a large amount of requests for training from places outside the country as well as inside the country. Such countries as Germany, Holland, England, Israel, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Mexico, and Spain have been involved. The general in-service trainees in the past have come from schools under contract by the Boards of Education in Baltimore County, Prince George's County, and a series of in-service training seminars--of one to three days duration were contracted by the Department of Health, Office of the Surgeon General, Johns Hopkins University and Boards of Education. The Institute permits visitations from university students and seminars have been given to the Department of Educational Technology at Catholic University, the Dept. of Educational Psychology, University of Maryland, Dept. of Neuro-psychiatry, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Dept. of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Johns Hopkins University, and other universities as far away as Western Michigan University.

Trainee to staff ratio is four full-time to one part-time (50 staff). The Institute trained approximately 60 in-service trainees last year over a period of 10 weeks or more and over 1,200 one, two or three day in-service training seminars; about 300 three-day parent training; about 100 in its night classes for professionals.

In-service training for teachers is predominantly given during school time with visitations scheduled to the laboratories at the Institute for Behavioral Research as well as offsite IBR laboratories at the public schools. Predominance of time has been spent with the teachers in seminars; however, the Executive Director feels

strongly that with the establishment of more laboratories designed specifically for training, over 60% of the time would be spent in laboratories rather than in the programmed instructional lecture and seminar facilities.

Pre- and post-testing of school principals, teachers, and administrative personnel. A series of forms designated to provide ongoing feedback is also used. The major method of testing the success of the trainee is by the measurement of increase in academic skills of their students. This is handled by a battery of pre- and post-tests, using national tests, as the means of measurement.

What is sorely needed is an increase of laboratories working with children in nursery schools, special education, etc., which would be designed so that 10 to 15 people can be trained while the sessions are in progress. At present, most of the research is designed for the operation of the research itself, and the teacher training program (in-service or other) tends to disrupt the classrooms. To control this problem, the Institute has limited visitation and servicing.

The direct proof of the effectiveness of the IBR is the increased funding from the Prince George's County Board of Education budget. The initial contract was in the amount of \$300 for a series of lectures. The funding was increased to \$68,000 last year, and it is anticipated that \$100,000+ will be awarded next year which will enable a contingency managed program to be instituted in an entire elementary school. Both Prince George's County and Montgomery County, as well as the District of Columbia, consider the IBR as their resource for educational technology and behavioral modification techniques. There is an excellent liaison between principals, superintendents, assistant superintendents, and heads of pupil personnel.

The Institute has not kept accurate cost records since its major thrust has been in research; however, it appears that there are four people whose major tasks are in-service training in behavior modification with the schools. The Executive Director spends 1/4 of his time in such activities, plus seven professional researchers give one evening or one morning to this activity per week. A guesstimate of the cost (including the Resources Center expenditures) would be about \$150,000 spent last year, and about \$200,000 to be spent next year. Next year's budget represents about 20% of their expected total budget. The Institute expects to do business in excess of \$1,000,000 beginning next September. The figures for training look like they range between \$4,000 to \$6,000 per trainee for an eight-month period. This is not a clear picture since it is averaged out with 10 weeks versus weekend participants in the program. Also, much support for training is actually being provided by the laboratory equipment, technical personnel, etc., of research programs which are being supported under general research.

The interest in the Institute for Behavioral Research is due to its reputation as a research center in operant psychology and behavioral design. The community looks to the Institute for its ability to provide technical know-how in programmed instruction, classroom contingency management, and behavioral control. The IBR is a specialized training center.

Due to the ongoing research at the Institute, it is unique. There are others, such as the American Institute of Research on the West Coast, but, in general, the power of the training center is the ongoing operational research as well as the basic research. The Institute has been in operation in the greater Washington area for ten years and commands the respect of the educational, psychiatric, psychological, and mental health communities. Its services are in demand.

Training material is not available at this moment. There are articles and reprints which are available for a small service charge. A text was written by some of the training staff which is called Training Professionals for the Establishment of Educational Environments. This described a special training program which was attended by 40 people who were involved with state and penal institutions. It is available from the IBR Press at \$6.50, and offers a good general description of some of the procedures presently being utilized in the in-service training of area teachers.

HAROLD L. COHEN
(INSTITUTE FOR BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH, INC.)

WASHINGTON SCHOOL PROJECT (ILLINOIS)

Max Beberman

In trying to find a desegregation plan, Champaign Schools asked the University of Illinois for help in making use of the one school which had been almost all black. The two institutions got together and arranged an in-service training facility, to be staffed by both. The university was responsible for the in-service "curriculum" and the school principal was responsible for the school curriculum. Parents volunteered children to be bussed to the school.

Funding came from three sources: N.S.F. (for emphasis in upgrading mathematics and science programs); the University to experiment with in-service training services); and the Champaign Schools (to provide teachers).

The formal objectives the program were to provide regular system elementary teachers with experience in setting up and teaching new curricula applicable to their schools and in ultimately involving other teachers there.

The subject matter consisted of standard elementary school subjects with a strong orientation toward the British Infant School model.

No protocols are now being developed and none are anticipated for the future.

The trainers are the school principal and the U. of I. College of Education Staff members (about four) who volunteered for the program. All are paid their regular salaries. None are formally evaluated as trainers.

The trainees (the teachers in the school) are assigned for a 3-4 year period to the school. The teachers are not volunteers. These teachers work very closely with other teachers and a subject matter specialist. They receive a regular salary, and teach a regular load. No special formal evaluation is made.

In all there are 430 students, 16 teachers, and four staff. The training ratio of 4:1 has less meaning because much trainee work is self-instructive. The atmosphere is more of a special working environment than a training situation.

The program does not formally evaluate its work. Trainees remain in the system and are evaluated by administrators in conventional ways.

The best training experience is that of giving full responsibility to teach while working closely with outstanding teachers. Many trainees like the orientation to British methods. The least adequate training experience seems to be the lack of systematic attention to the particular acts of the teacher. Also the long-term involvement seems difficult to transfer to other school buildings.

The community is quite pleased with the university's interest in the schools. The College of Education has increased its understanding of administrative problems dealing with integration.

No cost data is available.

Concerning the uniqueness of the program, two comments are in order. First, the talent of a university staff is, of course, not available in most communities and where it is, the university may not be so generous in supporting what is very much a single community service. Max Beberman believes that such a program could operate with just one educational specialist. If this is so, the program could be exported. However, it might be difficult to recruit high level (doctorate) people for such programs.

PERSONAL REACTION:

The respondent was excellent and has many good comments on the problem. I feel that this program should be looked at further, particularly because of its compatibility with the British Infant School approach.

ROBERT E. STAKE
(UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS)

**MULTI-INSTRUCTIONAL TEACHER PREPARATION AGENCY (EPDA)
(VERMONT)**

Mrs. Della Ellison (Executive Secretary)

Three full-time staff members (Director, Associate Director, Project Coordinator of Learning Materials Laboratory) form the central staff. The MITPA is directly responsible to Vermont's State Department of Education which administers the overall funding using Federal Funds. At this time the governing board is composed of 20 educators, institutional representatives, school board members, etc. who form the Vermont Advisory Board on Education. This advisory group recommends ideas, funding, etc. to the State Commissioner on Education. The commissioner has the power of veto.

Target population for MITPA is the adult citizen in the Montpelier area who has a bachelor's degree and is interested in teaching in the public schools but needs state certification. In addition, a secondary target population are those non-degreed adults who desire to work in the schools as teacher-aides.

Arrangements for student teaching and aides are presently made on a year-to-year basis with individual superintendents of schools in the Montpelier area. No other agencies are actively involved at this time although the program is less than one year old.

The program began with funds secured through the State Department of Education of Vermont. The individual who carried out most of the initiating activity was Dr. Leon Bruno of the State Department of Education (head of S & D).

MITPA's formal objectives are to train degreed adults in the community to receive certification allowing them to teach in the public schools. In addition, training of teacher-aides from a non-degreed population is accomplished, although this position is just beginning in the state.

Vermont's Department of Education grants 18 credits for certification upon successful completion of MITPA's 14-week program. There are no subject matter constraints. Each student group (per semester) is examined for its particular needs. Courses and school experiences are constructed for each trainee group.

No protocols have been produced as yet. The majority of the student teacher's time is spent in the classroom. Some out of school "laboratory" experiences have been scheduled. These are the typical visits. The learning materials center (just getting under way) will provide experiences for teachers-to-be to practice with and develop their own materials for classroom use.

Directors were hired by Dr. Bruno (State Department of Education) on recommendation of school administrators. No training of cooperating teachers exists at present nor is there any evaluation of cooperating teachers. No reward system exists beyond the intrinsic reward of helping newcomers into the profession.

The source of trainees is the entire surrounding community. Large advertising campaigns and public meetings bring forth inquiries. From applications, a group is chosen and trained. Rewards are certification at completion of program plus free "tuition." No college credit is granted--the credit is granted by the State. Placement now comes from student teaching experience. Many schools are interested in this program at this time. The evaluation team consists of MITPA directors, cooperating teachers, principals of schools, and the Division of Teacher Education (State). No formal procedures exist as yet for evaluation.

The staff to student ratio is approximately 10 students to one central staff member, less if cooperating teachers are included. Training is 14 weeks long, mostly in schools. No follow-up evaluation is practiced as yet. Seminars are held in MITPA center, and some field trips are made to lab schools in the area.

Ongoing evaluation does not exist. The State Advisory Committee on Education has the task of evaluation. This is mostly done by formal and informal site visits by members of this committee.

The best training experiences are visits to "open classrooms" Adults have been out of school long enough to have missed the changes in education. Participants cite the supervised teaching experience as most valuable. MITPA strives for daily contact between supervisory personnel and student teachers.

Least adequate training deals with the public relations field. Participants need a better program to learn how to deal successfully with the public.

During practice teaching many participants began to discover themselves, perhaps for the first time in their lives. Many positions were offered by cooperating school systems to trainees prior to completion of their training. However, participants pose a threat to some cooperating teachers in the schools because many participants are dynamic, mature adults.

The yearly budget runs \$30,000 plus \$10,000 to operate the Learning Materials Center. The respondent estimates the program now runs at \$1,000 per trainee per year.

This type of center could be replicated, but there is one question: Would the state provide certification and be satisfied with 14 weeks of training?

Essentially, MITPA needs several shakedown years to tell whether or not it is accomplishing its task. At this time, MITPA appears to be responding to an emergency situation (lack of good teachers). Such a problem may not exist in the future.

MITCHELL P. LICHTENBERG
(CLARK UNIVERSITY)

NATIONAL TRAINING LABORATORY INSTITUTE FOR APPLIED BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE (NTL)

Dr. Walter W. Sikes

The organizational structure of NTL is rather loose. Headquarters, in Washington, D. C., supports a central staff of some 20 professionals and 30 supportive personnel. Four regional offices (Chicago, Salt Lake City, Kansas City, and Oregon) serve as service centers. A board of directors heads NTL and consists of a wide range of school and business types.

NTL's distinctive feature consists of a network of about 600 members who have received NTL training. These members function as consultants and trainers in the field. They are scattered throughout the country and perform approximately 20 days of consultation per year. Of the 600 NTL members approximately 400 are active; of these 400, eighty per cent are university faculty members.

The central staff creates and generates programs which are then staffed by the NTL staff in the field. Three centers of activity (The Education Center, the Center for Organizational Studies for Business and Industry, and the Publications Division) form the basic core of the headquarters operation. Coordinating these centers is a coordinating committee which appears to be the mechanism for developing and maintaining the overall NTL program.

NTL conducts public laboratories for which individuals pay direct tuition fees. In addition, private contract programs which are set up for institutions or organizations for specific purposes. In one year approximately 10,000 individuals go through the public laboratories and about 2,000 are involved with the contract program.

The National Training Laboratories was formed in 1947 to serve as a focal agency in developing the laboratory method of learning group dynamics. Originally under the auspices of the National Education Association, it became a separate division in 1962 and in 1967 became an independent, non-profit corporation associated with the WRA, under the name, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science. The prime movers of NTL are: Leland Bradford, Ronald Lippitt, and Kenneth Benne, all of whom have been influenced by the work of Kurt Lewin and his concepts of individual and group behavior.

Dr. Sikes stated that the simplest version of NTL's objectives is "To apply behavioral science knowledge and skill to problems of personal and organizational change."

NTL provides direct training and consultation services. The training group experience comprises several designs which might

include role playing, non verbal activities, theory presentations, inter group exercises, unstructured processes and other experience based learning activities. Members of groups get a better view of their own ways of handling problems of human relations and can learn how their styles of working with people are seen by and affect others. Participants work together over an extended period of time and share feelings, reactions and perceptions about their process of interaction almost continuously. Their work may simply be the formation and development of the group itself, or it may be concerned with the need common to the occupation role or special interest of the group members.

In addition to its schedule of laboratory programs, NTL Institute also offers several types of services to individuals and organizations, all directed toward developing skills, processes and structures to help clients create solutions to their own problems. Training and consultations for organizations is based on their specific needs and aimed at a wide range of problems and processes such as: personnel development, managing growth and change, decision making, organizational renewal, improving conferences, developing team work, and developing new programs. Short term laboratories are also offered in negotiation skills, community actions, management skills, consultation skills, life planning and cross cultural interaction.

The major thrust for the future is the formation of the NTL University Institute which will be chartered in Virginia and will offer graduate level training providing a Master's Degree and also opportunities for post doctoral work. Land has already been purchased near Dulles Airport, and NTL looks forward to the development of a formal educational complex.

NTL Institute has published a number of books on training and research and several monograph length paperbacks are issued each year. A scholarly professional journal, The Journal of Applied Science, and an informal report on training activities, Human Relations Training News, are both published quarterly. The Publications Division of NTL is seen as a very important aspect of its operation. NTL endorses the Ethical Standards of Psychologists of the American Psychological Association, and it establishes very specific standards for training of a consultant who represents the NTL Institute.

NTL trainers are those individuals who go through the Intern Program. These Intern Programs are designed to train professionally qualified persons with interest in the application of behavioral science and science knowledge and methods for membership on the active staff of the "NTL Institute Network."

The trainees are professionals with advanced training and interest in one or more of the Institute's concerns--educational improvement, community development, organizational behavior in business, industry, government and other institutions; international and cross cultural communications. Candidates are expected to be experienced and competent professionals committed to the application of scientific knowledge and methods to the processes of planned change. Each applicant must arrange to be sponsored by a professional member, an associate, or a fellow of the NTL Institute who is willing to recommend and support the applicant. A personal interview is required for each applicant. A fee for the eight weeks Applied Behavioral Science Intern Program tuition, room and board is \$2,365 and the fees for the group leadership Intern Program of six weeks come to \$2,075. The trainees are evaluated by the staff conducting the laboratory or group where the trainee is receiving experience.

Training is carried on in the Public Laboratory which for 1970 will be held in Bethel, Maine, and Aspen, Colorado. The basic training unit is the laboratory which typically would include 10 to 12 members.

The Training Labs are held in conference centers which are rented. For example, at Bethel, Maine, or in Plymouth, New Hampshire. These could be schools or university conference centers, or community agencies which would have live-in facilities. For experiences which are focuses on personal behavior the location is somewhat isolated and offers space for outdoor activities, privacy and the enjoyment of nature. Other programs which may stress action in a particular special arena are conducted in that arena.

Dr. Sikes says that he looks at evaluation practically. The Laboratory is doing a good job if it is financially viable and if there are demands for the programs. Enrollment has been increasing over the years but it looks as if enrollment may be dropping off this year. They feel that the long-range trend, however, is for rising enrollment.

The best training experience is providing personal growth experience. The least adequate training experience is the impact of the laboratory's work on social systems and larger social problems. Dr. Sikes feels that it may be possible to increase human relations competencies, but there are system limitations which make it difficult to effect real social change. He sees that ways of making a more effective linkage between improved human relations competencies and the social system are perhaps the most important objectives for NTL to pursue in the future.

The training unit individual tuition fee is \$1,500 if the unit of training experience is taken to be the Intern Program of approximately eight weeks in length. A typical two-week laboratory runs at a tuition fee of \$325.

Basic organizational facilities, i.e. "the network," and training "trainees," should be generalizable. In fact, NTL is probably one of the prime generators of the current widespread interest in sensitivity training, encounter groups, and the whole human relations concern in education.

Materials are available on sensitivity training, laboratory method, organization development and other applications of behavioral science and human relations training from the NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science. Write to:

NTL Institute Publications
1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

PERSONAL REACTION:

Dr. Sikes was a most cooperative respondent, candid, informed, and strong. I feel that the "Institute Network" is a highly promising organization structure for providing widespread training.

HELEN KENNEY
(CLARK UNIVERSITY)

METRO-ATLANTA STUDENT TEACHING MODEL

Dr. Charles Franzen (Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service)

The Metro-Atlanta model is still in process of formation. Four schools are now designated as center schools with a center staff. Approximately 30 students are now enrolled. Almost all are from the University of Georgia and teach in the Atlanta Public Schools.

The ratio between the basic operating unit head (center coordinator) and student teachers is approximately 1:15. Ultimate responsibility falls upon the center team composed of coordinator, principal(s) of center schools, cooperating center teachers, and specialists.

The Metro-Atlanta model's primary target population is the pre-service or student teacher. In-service teaching programs are possible with center staff providing such programs, but such in-service work is not the main thrust of the program.

At this time, the Atlanta Public Schools agrees to accept student teachers for a nine-week training period (state mandated), using the Metro-Atlanta Student Teaching Model. The Center teachers and principals are Atlanta Public School personnel and serve without extra reimbursement at this time. University personnel are used as Center Coordinators (in general they are college student-teacher supervisors) however, school personnel as center coordinators are a definite possibility in the future.

The Atlanta area has had a professional teacher education service organization for 25 years. Dr. Franzen came two years ago as a director of the AATES, called a meeting of those institutions involved in Teacher Education and asked for thoughts on changing the present traditional system. From this evolved a series of committees which produced and are still working on the Metro-Atlanta Student Teaching Model.

No particular subject matter areas are stressed. Types of training are still in line with traditional ideas. The stress on the Metro model is in a new organization of staff, trainees, etc. The respondent felt it was too early to describe future plans presently being worked out.

At present, instructional procedures are traditional (whatever was being used before). Protocols are yet to be developed--a committee has been formed to investigate materials but has yet to produce. The striking difference in strategy is the abolition of the 1:1 ratio of student-teacher-to-teacher. The center staff (coordinator, school principal, center teachers, specialists) take on a

number of teachers (15?) and examine each individual student's needs and place him with various teachers (and experiences) accordingly. Some "laboratory" experiences are provided (field trips, etc.) but these are rather minor in relation to the classroom experience.

Trainers are essentially "cooperating teachers" and "college supervisors" now called center teachers and center coordinators respectively. Teachers are picked by the school administration, coordinators named by college administration. Training is traditional. No evaluation procedures of a formal sort exist at present. Rewards are apparently intrinsic ones for the time being.

Trainees are student teachers at area universities and colleges, recruited, rewarded, placed in the traditional manner. Evaluation presents a difference. Although not in effect this year, the model staff is forming a policy which will insist that only designated center schools be used for student teaching. When this becomes effective it will be possible that University A's student teachers will be evaluated by a center whose coordinator is from University B or from another source. Thus, this part of the student teacher's evaluation will be removed from the degree granting university which he is enrolled in.

Trainee to staff ratio is difficult to determine. There are roughly 15 students per center at present which could mean a ratio of four students per staff member. This figure is only temporary and will change in the near future.

All trainees are now full time. Each takes a nine-week college quarter to complete his student teaching requirement for certification. Training will take place at center schools. Students will not train in one school only but will be placed in several schools "according to their needs and experience." Training in outside institutions does not form a large part of the trainee's experience. The center has not begun to develop procedures to evaluate its own work.

Although it is too soon to judge the training experience, one problem has become apparent: There is little living space near to schools for trainees. At this time students spend much time commuting.

The respondent cites organization as a key factor to success. Turnover of personnel has been a problem. Although the major university is willing to place its faculty as coordinators on a full-time basis, no one is sure if other colleges can be so free with their talent. The model has also faced one drop-out recently. The reason cited was, "Our system is O.K. and doesn't need help." Provincialism will be a problem to overcome.

Georgia has highly centralized state organizations and school systems. Schools are county based and decision makers are easy to get to for information and action. The Teachers Education Service group has had a long history and provides a basis for both formal and informal work ties. The same people have been at this job for many years. Few people need convincing--cooperation has been, on the whole, excellent.

The concept of a center taking on a group and deciding on individual experiences is a step away from the norm that could be exported in principle. The groundwork provided by a tightly-knit group working with each other over the years cannot be taken elsewhere.

No protocol materials exist at present. While the respondent could not promise anything, he felt that the major committee would welcome exchanging protocol materials in the future.

PERSONAL REACTION:

At this time, there is too little hard information upon which to base any kind of judgment. The personnel on the committees who are working on the model are creative people, with many other responsibilities. Little was said about evaluation, except that it was in the works for the future. Similarly, the program is now running with 30 students, but no new protocol materials have been designed or introduced. Funding may be a problem in the future.

MITCHELL P. LICHTENBERG
(CLARK UNIVERSITY)

COOPERATIVE URBAN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

Grant Clothier, Director

The Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program (CUTE) was established in the summer of 1966 when representatives from 13 liberal arts colleges in Missouri and Kansas, the public school systems of Kansas City, Missouri, and Kansas City, Kansas, and the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory met to plan a cooperative student-teaching semester in inner city schools for volunteer future teachers from the participating colleges and universities. The first Kansas City cycle began in 1967. The University of Missouri--Kansas City, Lincoln University, and four other higher education institutions were added the following year. Enrollment in the program has averaged approximately 20 per semester. Similar CUTE programs were started in 1969 in Oklahoma City and Wichita, respectively.

The organizational structure of CUTE has a strong link to the McREL Administration. At the top the McREL corporate board, executive committee, and general staff oversee the operations of the CUTE program. The CUTE staff consists of a director for the overall program (in three locations) and a variety of full-time staff members (educational foundations, urban sociology, and inner city teaching methods). Psychological and psychiatric services are available on a part-time basis in each location. In addition, an Urban Teacher Education Committee represents the higher education institutions and school districts in each location. Additional community representatives and school personnel are utilized as needed. Twenty to thirty student teachers are trained each semester in each location.

In Kansas City and Wichita, participating higher education institutions pay \$250 tuition rebates for each student teacher they send. The Oklahoma City program is financed primarily with school district funds. Additional operating funds were supplied by the Danforth Foundation from 1967 to 1969.

McREL funds comprise the largest share of the operating budget in Kansas City and Wichita and finance the research components in all three locations. Cooperating classroom teachers receive \$80, \$40 from CUTE and \$40 from the school district.

The program was initiated when Dr. Grant Clothier approached McREL upon its establishment in 1966. Dr. Clothier had been director of the Inner-City Teacher Education Project (1966 AACTE Distinguished Achievement Award Program) at Central Missouri State College at Warrensburg, Missouri. Dr. Clothier proposed to expand this student-teaching project on a cooperative basis with other higher education institutions in the Kansas City Region. McREL adopted the project and formed the Urban Teacher Education Committee to help Dr. Clothier choose staff and plan the program.

Dr. Clothier and other McREL officials initiated the contacts which led to the development of the programs in Wichita and Oklahoma City.

The formal objectives for the training program have been stated in terms of understandings, attitudes, and skills to be acquired by future teachers participating in the program. The three-page list of these objectives is available.

The training curriculum places much greater emphasis on educational sociology, urban studies, and mental health or self-understanding on the part of the teacher than is common in most undergraduate teacher preparation programs. The mental health emphasis is developed in terms of concepts and findings of the University of Texas Research and Development Center on Teacher Education. The training program also draws as needed on material from educational psychology, curriculum development, measurement and evaluation, and other fields.

Experiences emphasized in the program include:

1. Eight weeks of classroom student teaching.
2. Visits to inner city communities, assignments working in agencies as the Black Economic Union, "urban plunges," "live-ins" with inner city families, and other assignments designed to develop personal knowledge of inner city residents and environments.
3. Case studies of inner city students.
4. Role-playing and simulation of inner city teaching situations.
5. Group-process discussions.
6. Interaction analysis as a technique for improving teaching understanding and self-awareness.
7. Micro teaching.

The curriculum guide for the training program is specifically organized in terms of the University of Texas conceptualization of stages of teacher growth. (A copy of this guideline is available; copies are available free from McREL.)

The training curriculum is adapted and applied by the staff in accordance with day-to-day needs of the program, and the trainees, with as much flexibility as possible to make the program successful.

Materials such as the SRA Teaching Problems Laboratory and the McGraw-Hill Textfilms are used at the discretion of the staff. Several in-house video tapes also have been prepared to introduce classroom problems and specific teaching skills.

Staff members have been recruited informally by the Director. In addition to his own contacts, suggestions concerning potential staff have been made by various university and public school officials. Part-time staff members in psychiatry and mental health have been recruited through or with the help of the Menninger Foundation.

Evaluation of the staff is relatively informal, mostly through observation of the director and through self-study and group meetings continuously carried on by the staff. Logs, diaries, reaction forms, and other data supplied by the trainees during as well as at the completion of the semester also have been very useful in evaluating the curriculum and the staff and in improving the program.

Trainees are recruited by the Urban Teacher Education Committee members and other faculty members at the participating institutions. MEREL staff members often visit the campuses to explain the program and help in recruiting.

Graduates of CUTE are placed in inner city teaching positions at the discretion and according to needs identified by the personnel departments of the participating school districts.

Little is done in the way of formal evaluation of recruitment practices. Trainees are evaluated by staff members and cooperating teachers.

The 16-week semester includes an eight-week student teaching semester toward the end. Student teaching is preceded by extensive orientation and followed by a period of wrap-up and evaluation. However efforts are made continuously to provide direct, practical classroom contacts before student teaching and to continue theoretical and conceptual study during student teaching. The success of these efforts is made possible by the fact that most of the staff consists of full-time persons working exclusively on the program and maintaining close, intensive contact with trainees throughout the program.

Most of the classes at Kansas City and Oklahoma City are held in rooms in the public schools, but classes occasionally are held in community agencies, homes, and other locations. In Wichita the majority of classes are held in a dormitory on the edge of the inner city (where many of the trainees also live). During the first year in Kansas City (1967), similarly, classes were generally held and trainees lived in a campus residence hall.

As noted elsewhere, other types of activities are frequently scheduled in inner city neighborhoods, agencies, and other locations.

Five of the trainees in Kansas City live in an inner city apartment building leased by CUTE.

Formal evaluation by McREL emphasizes:

- Reactions and attitudes of the participants.
- Percent of graduates who desire, accept, and/or remain in inner city teaching positions.
- Trainees' and graduates' teaching behaviors and changes in behaviors as assessed by observers utilizing interaction analysis and other approaches.

Instruments which have been used in the evaluation include the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (as adapted by Houge), the Teaching Situation Reaction Test (Duncan), the Brown Self-Report Inventory, the Semantic Differential, the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventor, the Cultural Attitude Inventory (Skeel), the McREL Interaction Analysis System (as adapted from Flanders), and the Pensacola Z Scale (Jones).

Another notable aspect of evaluation has been the input provided by inner city parents, citizens, and agency officials who meet with and interview trainees in Kansas City. This input has been particularly helpful in evaluating the educational and urban sociology curriculum and has been solicited by the staff sociology specialist specifically for this purpose.

Dr. Clothier believes that the best part of the program is the curriculum and training in educational and urban sociology which is designed to acquaint trainees with the nature and reality of conditions in the inner city. He is least satisfied with the program's efforts to help trainees develop specific teaching skills and behaviors needed in the inner city, and he has concluded that a one-semester program does not provide enough time to allow for adequate assimilation of all the training experiences that are conducted and all the materials which are provided for this purpose.

The most important side effects have included the following:

- Trainees get to see inner city schools and neighborhoods from the "inside" and consequently tend to become dissatisfied with and critical of the operation of city school bureaucracies.

- Some trainees undergo nearly "traumatic" experiences as they examine their own attitudes and prejudices and perceive the effects of major social institutions in the inner city.

In some cases families, marriages, and/or personal relationships have become more polarized as a result of the knowledge and commitments developed among the trainees.

Pressure is building up, at least informally, to move experienced but untrained and incompetent teachers out of inner city schools as trained CUTE graduates become available to fill these positions. There is a tendency for some of the participating higher education institutions particularly the larger ones--to pretend that sending a few students to CUTE discharges their responsibility to the inner city and to use CUTE as an excuse to maintain the status quo in education and other fields.

In at least one Kansas City cycle there were acute problems within the training group. These problems were related to polarization between "radical" and "conservative" trainees and to the difficulties trainees from small, religious-oriented colleges experienced in learning to handle freedom in a relatively unsupervised situation in a big city.

The most "representative" or "indicative" location for this purpose is in Wichita. In Kansas City various costs are absorbed in program development and "packaging" activities under McREL: in Oklahoma City the public schools support much of the program on an assigned-time basis.) Costs in Wichita are running at approximately \$65,000 per academic year for 60 trainees (about 30 each semester). Wichita staff are paid at McREL rates, which are somewhat above local salary schedules.

Many types of aid and assistance have been provided from a variety of sources in the three locations, but none can be said to have been totally indispensable or irreplaceable. Examples of these important inputs are:

Office and classroom space provided by the public schools.
Close assistance and guidance which VISTA workers provided for Kansas City trainees in 1969.

Assistance of local chapters of the Welfare Rights Organization in arranging weekend "live-ins" with inner city families.

Financial assistance from the Danforth Foundation.

Videotape and other audiovisual equipment and supplies furnished by the public schools in Oklahoma City.

At present the programs in Kansas City and Wichita (but not Oklahoma City) are dependent on the financial support of McREL.

Because CUTE is a Regional Educational Laboratory Project, it is explicitly designed to be "packaged," i.e. exported and replicated with suitable modification and adaptation in other metropolitan areas. This accounts for the heavy emphasis on formal evaluation and on development and dissemination of curriculum guides, research results, and descriptive reports. By next fall McREL expects to publish a handbook that will give guidance in initiating and implementing the model.

The following paper-bound reports, among others, are available free of charge from McREL:

Curriculum Guidelines for Inner City Teachers, Grant

Clothier, ed., October, 1969

Innovation in the Inner City. A Report on the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program. Grant Clothier and James H. Lawson, January 1969.

Cooperation: A Key to Urban Teacher Education. Grant Clothier and James Zurick, June 1969.

A Summary of the Evaluation of the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program. Wilford Weber and James H. Lawson, October, 1968.

PERSONAL REACTION:

Dr. Clothier is a reliable and honest source of information. In addition to knowing more about the program than anyone else, he is one of the outstanding persons in the country working to prepare inner city teachers. He is realistic about his own program and necessarily is very well aware of the problems involved and shortcomings encountered in attempting to work with school districts, universities, colleges, and other institutions.

I agree with Dr. Clothier that CUTE is doing as much as reasonably is possible to prepare inner city teachers within the limitations of a one-semester program dependent on the cooperation of many established institutions. Since it has been obvious that UM-KC trainees in CUTE are immeasurably better prepared for inner city assignments than are future teachers in our standard campus program, I have been a strong supporter from the start and agreed to serve on the governing committee in Kansas City for a year and a half.

However, I also agree with Dr. Clothier that a one-semester program is clearly inadequate and that CUTE must be expanded into a more comprehensive, well-articulated program if it is ultimately to achieve its goals.

Even though McREL has not been able to solve the extremely difficult problems involved in evaluating a training program for inner city teachers, I admire the professionalism with which this task has been approached and the lab's willingness to assign significant amounts of resources for this purpose.

DANIEL U. LEVINE
(UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY)

SMOKY MOUNTAIN CULTURAL ARTS DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

Dr. Edgar Vom Lehn, Director of SMCADA Project

The SMCADA Project is funded by ESEA, Title III, and is funded directly to the Jackson County Board of Education and, therefore, is under the direct administration of the superintendent of schools. However, the project itself covers eight counties in the Southwestern North Carolina area. There is an advisory board of 36 lay people and a Board of Directors made up of the eight superintendents of the school systems involved in the project, plus the chairman of the advisory committee. There is an executive committee of three people which comes out of the board of directors which works directly with the superintendent of schools in Jackson County and with the project director who is Dr. Edgar VomLehn. Under the project director there is a project coordinator and also research supervisors at the present time too. The remainder of the staff includes regional specialists and underneath these people are 26 consultants who work directly with classroom teachers and pupils.

The contract is made by Title III of North Carolina with the Jackson County Board of Education and the project is administered by the project director and the Board of Directors which is composed of the eight superintendents of the school systems involved. The project is supported primarily from Title III funds with a small amount being put up by the eight school systems. This amount during the first year was \$9,000 and the second year was \$11,000. Title III funds which were given to the project for the first year were \$292,000 and for the second year \$280,000.

The training center got started with a planning grant from Title III which was given to enable the schools in this area of the state to determine their greatest needs. Dr. Edgar VomLehn was employed to make this study, and it was decided that the greatest need in the mountain area was in the area of cultural arts. The study found that there was a definite lack of any instruction in the cultural arts, and as a result the cultural arts were not being used to enhance the teaching of reading and the other subjects being taught in the traditional manner in the mountain area. The study discovered that in the 75 schools in this area there were only 14½ equivalent professional people working in the cultural arts area and of these 75% were band directors in the secondary school program.

The major objective of this training center was to develop a comprehensive and sequential course of study in the cultural arts for children in the mountain area and also to develop a systematic guide for arts learning in the secondary schools. The course of study was planned to include a variety of experience with which to

nurture the child's growth in the arts. A second major objective was to continue to expand and improve the ability of elementary school teachers and secondary school teachers in the teaching of the cultural arts. As the project developed, a detailed, sequential curriculum in the cultural arts was developed for classroom teachers of eight mountain counties using empirical process and incorporating folk cultures of the region.

At the beginning of the program, the subject matter was limited to art and music. However, as the program grew it moved into the area of drama and dance. In addition, as these subjects were put into the curriculum, they were related and correlated with other areas such as reading, mathematics, and so forth.

Concept units of a working syllabus are initiated by a research staff, advised by visiting educators and university scholars. These units are disseminated, applied in the classroom by teachers and SMCADA consultants working together, evaluated and refined. Such classroom tested units will be published and made available to anyone wanting to use them. The process is very similar to what we are talking about in training complex because the protocols and materials are developed, making use of consultants, teachers in the classroom, and then the consultants who help develop the protocols go out and get in the classroom and work with students. As a rule, the consultant takes over and teaches, making use of the protocols, and gradually brings the teacher into the teaching process. After the local teacher becomes thoroughly competent in using the protocols then the consultant moves on to another school situation with other teachers. Much of the media used is made by the consultants at the center. However, some things like record players and pianos have been bought by the local schools.

Some of the trainers are regular professional people who have been teaching art and music in the schools and others are resident musicians and artists in this mountain area. Approximately half of the people are resident artists and musicians, some of whom have had college training and others who have not. The trainers, whether they are professional people or resident artists and musicians are paid a regular salary for full time work in the center. In addition to the trainers, the director of the program was a professor of music at Western Carolina University and he now serves full time working with the training center. In addition to the trainers and the director, the program has a coordinator and two research supervisors. The director of the program, the coordinator, and the research supervisors are all involved in what goes on in the school as they work with the program. On an average 25% of the people who direct the program and who serve as coordinators and research supervisors spend their time in the school with teachers and students.

The trainees are regular elementary school teachers who teach in the schools in the eight school systems. The trainees receive no pay. One reason for this is that the trainers go directly into the classrooms of the trainees and work with the students of the trainees. In addition to working with the students of the trainees, the trainers carry with them materials and media which are used in teaching in the classrooms. After the trainees become competent in the use of materials then the trainer moves on leaving the written materials for the teacher to teach the second week. The third week the trainer is back working with the students and teachers and this cycle continues.

Each consultant works with approximately 24 teachers a week. This is done by going to a school and working with six elementary teachers each day for four days of the week. On the fifth day, the consultant is back at the center working with the total consultant group in an institute type program.

The trainees are trained in the schools and in their own classrooms. Although this is where the great majority of training takes place, there are workshops and institutes held for the teachers in the eight-county areas from time to time dealing with specific areas of the cultural arts.

When the program started, a pre-test was given to students and teachers to determine their knowledge and competencies in the area of the cultural arts and each year a post-test is being given to see what progress is being made. So far, the evaluation which has been done shows a considerable increase in the knowledge and competencies in the area of cultural arts both for students and teachers. In addition to in-house evaluation, the project is constantly scrutinized by outside consultants who visit the program for several days and leave a written evaluation of what they think the program has accomplished. The writer of this report was one such consultant who spent considerable time in the schools where the training was taking place and wrote an evaluation for the project. For further information on the evaluation see the application for the second continuation grant of this project in which they report their evaluation techniques.

The project director and the trainees have involved local groups of artists and music people and in addition they have gone to civic clubs and organizations to get them interested and involved in the project. The project has now developed to where they have SMCADA East which is located in Waynesville, North Carolina, and SMCADA West which is located in Andrews, North Carolina. In both of these areas, they have circulating libraries for the use of the people involved in the cultural arts.

Much of what this training center is doing could be exported, at least the techniques used could be exported. Much of the music and art is taken from the local culture and whether or not this could be exported is questionable. However, the actual units developed and the protocol material could be passed on and used in other areas. The techniques used for training the trainees and the system which is used to secure trainers and to train the trainers so they can work with teachers, are also unique and could be used by other centers. The idea of eight different school systems being willing to work together on a common project is also something, of course, that is unique.

The protocol materials developed in this project can be secured by writing Dr. Edgar VomLehn, SMCADA, Box 277, Sylva, North Carolina. At the present time, the State Department of Education in North Carolina has a policy which limits the distribution of the protocol material outside of the region served by the project. The only way you can get around this is to get special permission from the State Department of Education in North Carolina. I am sure this permission can be obtained if one so desires to make such a request.

Dr. Edgar VomLehn is an outstanding professional person in his field. He is a creative individual who has done much for the mountains of Southwestern North Carolina and is a very responsible individual. I am sure the information you would receive from him would be valid and usable.

PERSONAL REACTION:

I personally feel that this project has many of the qualities of a training complex, and we could learn much from what these people are doing as they move into the schools to work with teachers and students.

HERBERT W. WEY
(APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY)

THE EPD CONSORTIUM E

Emmitt D. Smith

A plan for statewide coordination of educational personnel development in Texas was approved by the State Board of Education in the summer of 1968 and became effective about September 1, 1968. This plan set up six Educational Personnel Development Consortia, each based on the geographic grouping of three or four Education Service Center Regions, and including all colleges and universities, all Education Service Centers, and all public elementary-secondary schools in membership.

EPD Consortium E is one of the six consortia. It is situated in the Panhandle and South Plains of Texas with Amarillo, Lubbock, Abilene, and Wichita Falls serving as population centers.

At the State level, a Program Coordinator for EPD serves as executive director for the Council on Educational Personnel Development, a body of 28 representing all segments of the profession plus all major divisions of the Texas Education Agency. The Program Coordinator is a professional appointment to the staff of the Assistant Commissioner for Instruction and Teacher Education. All policies and procedures developed in the EPD Council are reviewed and formalized by the State Board of Education.

At the Consortium level, the Board of Directors is made up of representatives from higher education, the Education Service Center, and the public schools. In Consortium E, four members represent colleges and universities, four represent Education Service Centers, and four represent public schools. The Board of Directors administer the Consortium program using the Program Coordinator as the executive. One of the Education Service Centers, legally constituted as an LEA, serves the Consortium as the Fiscal Agent.

In Consortium E there are 4 Education Service Centers, 15 colleges and universities, and 260 public school districts. These 279 institutions serve as the operational units in the Consortium. About 10% of the student population of the State reside in this Consortium area. It is comparatively sparsely settled.

To date, most of the work done under Consortium coordination is actually effected through letters of agreement or verbal agreement between the Program Coordinator representing Board policies and the operational unit or units involved.

In 1969-70, five EPDA-B2 projects were conducted under coordination of Consortium E. Four of these projects recruited, provided

summer intensive training, and long-term inservice training for 100 teacher aides. One project performed the same procedure for 25 kindergarten teachers. The four Teacher Aide projects involved agreements between Consortium E and four participating operational sub-consortia:

Amarillo College, several public schools, and Region 16, Education Service Center.

Texas Tech. University, several public schools, and Region 17, Education Service Center

Hardin Simmons University, the Abilene Public Schools, and Region 14, Education Service Center

Midwestern University, Wichita Falls Public Schools, Region 9, Education Service Center

The total grant to support the projects was received from the State by Consortium E. Disbursements were made to the four participating sub-consortia by the Consortium Fiscal Agent.

The original planning for the State coordinating structure involving the six Consortia was done by Dr. Emmitt Smith in the summer of 1968 while serving as a full-time consultant to the Texas Education Agency, Office of Planning. Dr. Smith developed the plan with the help of many groups within the Texas Education Agency and a number of outside consultants, e.g. Dr. L. D. Hasker, University of Texas.

In Consortium E, these emphases have been used thus far:

- Early Childhood Education
- The Teacher Aide
- Teacher Certification
- The High Education Potential Child

This, also, depends on the project; e.g., each of the four projects dealing with the preparation of Teacher Aide cooperatively developed instructional plans and materials. An effort is now under way to develop an instructional plan for the preparation of Teacher Aide which incorporates the best features of each of the four plans. This improved plan will be printed and junior colleges will be encouraged to use. No protocols have been developed to date.

To date in all instructional programs, all trainers of trainees have been cooperatively selected because of their qualifications to fill a certain need. No additional training has been provided. In the Texas Teacher Certification Project Leadership Teams including

representatives from college-university, public school administration, public school teaching, and student teaching, were trained by the Consortium Program Coordinator after he had worked with the remaining five Coordinators in training at the State level.

Regarding trainees, guidelines provided by the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, U. S. Office of Education, have been followed in all projects funded through EPDA. Decisions made at the Consortium level in this regard were made by the Consortium Board of Directors.

Typically one full-time director-instructor and one full-time assistant are used for each 25 full-time trainees. Numerous outside, short-time consultants are used in addition. The training, which takes place in the summer, is typically six weeks in length, sometimes four weeks; long-term training ranges from 30 to 60 clock hours in length.

Summer instruction is provided on a participating college campus and in a laboratory situation typically provided by a participating public school. Long-term instruction may occur on a college campus, in an Education Service Center, or in a public school. So far, few situations in the community other than those connected with the school (such as Headstart) have been used.

Typically summer instruction focuses on the college campus physically and long term in an Education Service Center or in a public school. Evaluation, on the other hand, takes somewhat the reverse focus. Education Service Center and public school personnel function in summer instruction, and a team functions in the long-term representing college, Education Service Center, and public schools from the three Education Service Center areas outside the location of the projects. This practice seems to provide objectivity.

Follow-up to date has taken place in connection with long-term instruction while on the job. The evaluators serve essentially as consultant-evaluators seeking to reveal remaining problems felt by the student participant and then basing continuing instruction on this problem analysis.

Best experiences result from a situation which involves all three partners in a participating sub-consortium--college, Education Service Center, the school, and the student. This is true in planning, particularly true in the operational phase of the program, and true in evaluation. Least adequate experiences result when members of the sub-consortium in effect agree that one of the members will function for the other two; e.f. the Education Service Center will evaluate for us, or the college will provide our summer instruction.

Again the best and worst spin-off categories are directly related to the depth level of cooperation within the participating sub consortium. Best examples of spin-off occur when the partners realize they do their best work together and learn they can't get along alone; e.g. when a consortium activity is completed, they continue to work together. The worst spin-off occurs when the partners heave a sigh of relief when the consortium project is completed and go back to their good old comfortable ways of doing things.

In 1969-70 Consortium E spent roughly \$150,000 on 150 full-time participants, or about \$1,000 each.

In Texas in 1969-70 within the six EPD Consortia, approximately 1,000 trainees were involved in about 30 projects. The organization, activity, and evaluation conducted in Consortium E is typical of all consortium activity in the State.

It is a little early for instructional protocol material. Organizational protocol materials can be obtained from any of these people, the Program Coordinators:

Dr. Alfred Little, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas

Dr. Billy Pope, Education Service Center, Region 10,
Richardson, Texas

Kyle Killough, Education Service Center, Region 4,
Houston, Texas

Dr. Roger Harrel, Education Service Center, Region 19,
El Paso, Texas

Dr. Milton Smith, Education Service Center, Region 13,
Austin, Texas

Dr. Louis Holder, Education Service Center, Region 2,
Corpus Christi, Texas

Dr. Emmitt Smith, PESO Education Service Center, Region 16,
Amarillo, Texas

I am sure all materials at this stage of development are free.

EUGENE E. SLAUGHTER
(SOUTHEASTERN OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGE)

FAR WEST LABORATORY FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

James Hemphill, Director

The Far West Regional Laboratory is an R & D center operated under a joint powers agreement between the State Boards of Education (California, Utah, Nevada), the Board of Regents, Monterey County, San Francisco Unified School District, California.

The Board of Directors numbers 26 members and has wide authority to initiate research and development efforts in education. The staff totals 180 and sees elementary and secondary school teachers as its immediate target population.

Funding is primarily from USOE (70%) with the rest from various other sources (foundations, etc.). The Laboratory has a five-year contract, has increased its budget some 42%, and is operating from a ten year plan. Its major task deals with educational products, however, in the design and testing of these products, teacher training is a necessity.

Contractual arrangements are very varied (partly due to the diverse functions of the Laboratory).

The Laboratory began from USOE plans and input from J. Zacharrias.

The formal objectives of the Laboratory are quite broad. Essentially, anything that helps children to learn is under the laboratory's umbrella of investigation. Behavioral Objectives are listed in various Laboratory publications. There are no constraints concerning subject matter.

Protocols will be released to commercial publishers for production and dissemination. (MacMillan Educational Services has developed the first mini-course: "Effective Questioning in a Classroom Discussion--Elementary Level"--film).

Trainers are recruited from a wide variety of sources (university, industry, schools). Many students from California are also used.

Trainees (teachers, school administrators, pre-school community workers) spend most of their time receiving training in the schools. However, the training varies with the particular division of the Laboratory and its particular project.

The Laboratory evaluates its work through USOE teams. An executive panel (including outsiders and staff) meets two days every other month (8 outside, 3 board, 6 staff).

The respondent is displeased with the training function as it now exists at the Laboratory. The program for staff educational development is not well organized and is not very successful. The Laboratory is more concerned with getting the product out (its major task) than with training. The money spent on training is very small (about 1%) of the total overall budget of 3.5 million dollars.

The Laboratory feels, however, that it has a good approach to on-the-job training and has some good mini-courses and instructional tapes.

Summing up, one must be clear that the Laboratory is primarily a Research and Development Lab, not a teacher training institution. Those protocols which have been developed will be released through commercial producers or through the Lab as preliminary versions.

The recommendation is that the Training Complex and the Laboratory are somewhat different animals and should remain separate. The materials which are appropriate to Training Complexes should be studied carefully for their utilization.

ELI M. BOWER
(UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA)

MILWAUKEE PROJECT (EARLY CHILDHOOD TRAINING)

Richard Heber

This research project is staffed with a program director, a director of testing, two curriculum consultants, a full-time supervisor (Milwaukee) and eight full-time aides for children.

The experimental group consists of 25 children to mentally retarded mothers; and the control group consists of an identical group. The population is located in a public school serving a Milwaukee ghetto community. Local black adult females are aides. The children start the program at six months of age and continue to Kindergarten.

Funding is through a division of HEW (Rehabilitation Training.

The project began in 1966. Contracts were made with the schools, community groups, etc. for aid, support and space.

The formal objectives of the project concern:

1. Research in early stimulation of children of mentally retarded adults.
2. Preparation of local aides to conduct the stimulation.

Since this is a research project, subject matter is constrained to:

1. Verbal stimulation
2. Games
3. Attentivity training
4. Introduction to color, shape, form, size
5. Sequential learning

The aides develop, with curriculum consultants, a series of learning tasks for the children. The basis is eclectic. Media include chalk board, radio, TV, toys, games, and performance of tasks.

Graduate students at the University are the curriculum consultants. The supervisor in the school is an early childhood specialist.

The trainees (aides) are locally recruited. They are paid \$5,000 per year and are trained specifically for the project. No provision is made for placement after the project reaches completion. The

training ratio is on a 3:8 basis. Training takes place during and after daily sessions by discussion and demonstration. Actual materials which the children use are used by the trainees. Most training (90%) takes place in the school with the remainder at the University.

No evaluation of the aides, beyond a direct observation is made. The project evaluates its major task using independent testing of the children. Curriculum and testing are kept separate.

Trainees concluded that the best training experiences occurred when they could participate in the decision-making process in developing curriculum. Least liked were the decisions reached about curriculum which did not involve the aides.

Aides also noted an increased interest in teaching and their family. They cited the lack of jobs or credentials following the project as the worst side effect of the job.

Costs cannot really be compared with a training complex operation since the project centers on research. \$385,000 covers the training of 25 children, testing of a control group, eight aides, two curriculum specialists, one supervisor, and two directors.

The research project is clearly too costly to export as is. However, early day-care centers could be modeled after the project perhaps using college and/or high school personnel as aides. Protocol materials will be published by the project staff.

PERSONAL REACTION:

This is a high-cost project. The training of aides is expensive, and much modification would be needed for adaptation to regular community work. If a training complex sees its task as working with non-college training programs with ghetto-like populations, I recommend this project as a good starting point of investigation.

VERNON HAUBRICH
(UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN)

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
DOCTORAL PROGRAM IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Dr. Michael Usdan

The program will be administered by the Educational Administration Committee of the C.U.N.Y. School Agency, and community people will work with the program as adjunct professors. Responsibility for student training is shared between the university and the adjunct staff. Urban school system personnel (pupils and teachers) will form the target population.

Contractual arrangements will exist with the adjunct staff so that the trainees can work in their institutions and agencies (NAACP, AFT, OEO, etc.) In-house staff are drawn from the regular faculty of the university.

The program apparently owes much of its start to Dr. Michael Usdan and has grown out of his experiences and research in the Great Cities and Harvard internship programs. Other inputs came from various anti-poverty and civil rights programs, business and industry, and welfare organizations.

The model under which this program will operate is that of a professional school of medicine of public administration. It closely resembles the Ed.D. program at Harvard in that no formal dissertation is required. The primary objective is to train practitioners of urban educational administration for top leadership roles. The staff will examine the on-going performance of the trainees on their assigned tasks (agency placement, case studies, budget analysis). A final project which demonstrates clinical competence in public administration and innovative thinking will be required.

Usdan emphasizes that the program does not conflict with the traditional sixth year program geared to producing principals and similar supervisory personnel. Therefore, no subject matter constraints exist on the program such as educational finance, or educational law. While the program deliberately steers away from courses or units, it does "rely heavily on concepts of certain disciplines such as sociology": it emphasizes team teaching (social and behavioral scientists working together with the educational administration faculty to examine field applicability of the disciplines); it emphasizes the "how-to" aspects of becoming a school policy maker and implementer, using field work and a sequenced course which starts with simple administrative problems and moves through complex social engineering of the schools. All field experiences are monitored by the faculty.

Protocols are now under development. Extensive use of closed circuit television and video-tape is planned.

The trainers will be university and field-experienced people. University faculty from educational administration and other academic disciplines have committed themselves to the program and the kinds of training it espouses. Field-experienced people will be chosen for proven accomplishment and will be evaluated on a student feedback system. Faculty inspection of trainee placement and orientation, interviews and continuing dialogues with adjunct staff (field experience) will constitute the training of adjunct staff.

The trainees would be selected from the usual channels with stress on minority groups. Peace Corps, law schools, young activist channels will be explored. Rewards during training will include fellowships, involvement in socially relevant social programs, and ultimately paid internships in school systems. Placement after training would be in top level line or staff positions in schools, state departments, or municipal agencies, or community superintendencies in decentralized districts. Evaluation of trainees would be clinical (adjunct staff plus faculty) and utilize the peer group (fellow students and other agency personnel). A conflict with the usual academic evaluation criteria is expected as the program gets under way.

Fifteen fulltime trainees will be taken during the first year. Ultimately thirty per year is the goal by the end of a five-year period. Staff to trainee ratio will be better than 1:1 (based upon three fulltime Educational Administration faculty; six half-time adjunct faculty; and six from the disciplines; plus some clinical supervision and no part-time trainees). Training encompasses a three-year period. Each period is nine months.

The training will take place in regular classrooms at the university, at the public schools, in agencies and community organizations. "Laboratory" simulations will be used as well as closed circuit television from schools, offices and other parts of the city.

The staff feels that the best training experience will be the field placement. A secondary benefit may come from the development of simulation of conflicts and programs. The least adequate portion of the program may come from the hoped-for merger of the arts and sciences disciplines with the educational administration faculty.

Michael Usdan felt that by developing top people in the field, his program would receive its greatest leverage for bringing about school system-wide change.

While costs are very difficult to estimate, they will probably be close to \$15,00 per student.

The program is not dependent upon any one key man. In fact, if this program takes hold there is no reason why it can't be replicated in any big city, given the willingness of agency heads to cooperate. Usdan promises our group access to the protocols and materials, as they are developed.

PERSONAL REACTION:

I am intrigued by the concept that leadership and change-making can be trained at the university level. My hunch is that it can't, particularly for the urban school setting and, as I know it, for the New York scene. The recent powerful educational leaders--Shanker and McCoy--are perfect cases in point. Shanker grew out of the lower-class radical groups of the thirties; McCoy from the lower-class nationalistic blacks of the same period, but typically both were not seriously inclined towards educational leadership in their training. I suspect both McCoy and Shanker are trained in ideology, not in administration; in the rough and tumble of survival in the minority groups. The question is: "How do you train a radical?" I don't think the answer is in the educational administration program here outlined.

Probably the graduates of this program will grow up to be top flight number two men to the social change personnel needed to bring about the renovation of dying urban schools: The analysts, mappers, and second-level executives to operate the change-over. If the Usdan-Urban Educational Administration program does nothing but that, it would be contributing a good deal.

MORTIMER KREUTER

(STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
AT STONY BROOK)

THE TEACHERS, INC.

Roger Landrum and Paul Genser

The Teachers, Inc. is governed by a Board of Directors consisting of 11 people: 6 teachers, 1 college representative, and 4 community people. The directors are elected by members of the overall corporation for two-year terms. In turn, the directors elect a president.

A central staff of about six people, headed by the President of the Board of Directors, Roger Landrum, who serves permanently in the organization as a stimulator. The organization is responsive to outside groups from the neighborhood in which it works (Two Bridges are of the lower East Side of New York). The nature and number of the outside groups change and presumably Teacher, Inc. will respond to changing needs.

The elementary and junior high schools of the Two Bridges area (pupils, teacher trainees, and parents but not--generally--the school administrators) are the target population. The ratio of staff to teacher trainee population is not clear but seems to be about 1:8. There is no way to determine staff to total population ratios.

Teachers, Inc. deals with its central staff on a verbal contract basis; generally the terms are elastic (lasting as long as the grants hold out).

Contracts for trainees are more formal, lasting in writing for one year (summer, plus academic year). Trainees are paid \$75.00 a week during the summer, out of which they must pay \$30-\$35 a week to local families with whom they board during the two-month period.

Teachers, Inc. has a one-year contract with the University of Massachusetts to train teachers through the S.U.N.Y. at Westbury, L.I., N. Y. structure.

The Teachers, Inc. grew out of the Peace Corps impetus. Harris Woffard was a guiding spirit, as was the current leader, Roger Landrum, also a Peace Corps designer, planner, and teacher. A S.N.C.C. organizer and another educational activist rounded out the nuclear organizational group.

The inception of the experiment in local control of inner city education (The Two Bridges Model School District) provided the locus for the organizational group to begin its operations (Spring, 1968). The Teachers, Inc. approached the Two Bridges Governing Board which invited the group into the district and a close, almost organic relationship has existed ever since.

As nearly as could be determined, the purpose of the group is to work for non-violent fundamental change in public education.

The group fights the established public educational system and its objectives are to become immersed in the community's life as well as its schools." Probably the objectives are the same as those of its ideological parents, the Peace Corps, and the civil rights, and the experimental colleges movements.

The training objectives, as gleaned from the interview and house literature, were to achieve:

- a. Skills training and practice teaching experience;
- b. Direct experience with host families, agencies, and the streets;
- c. Political sensitivity through seminars around issues.

The subject matter is largely professional education, supplemental by subject field courses chosen by the trainee. The program is a 36 credit hour Masters in community education, administered by the group and awarded by the University of Massachusetts. The 24 credits in education are those given by the group in the training period; the subject courses must be taken at the university level. An assumption is made that an intellectual discipline has been acquired at the B.A. level prior to entering the training.

Summer training materials for trainees have been developed but are in a very primitive state and were not evaluated nor are they available. Some video and audio-tapes were made of training sessions, are being edited, and will be available at some point.

The educational trainers were selected by personal judgments of effectiveness as community-oriented classroom performers. No observation schedules or selection guides were used.

The program also used community trainers to train teachers and parents. These trainers are selected from the ranks of those judged to be effective community workers, not necessarily professionally trained.

The program is only now beginning to train educational and community trainers and training protocols are being developed for this purpose. Originally, the trainers were expected to get in and do their stuff without training in the organizational philosophy (or in training itself as a process). The trainers will be paid during the training. The evaluation tends to be subjective: If it works, it is O.K. Additionally, the training sessions are to be evaluated as to the trainer's level of performance before and after training and on the feedback system of the central staff (links with trainers, neighborhoods, etc.).

Source: The trainees are recruited from returning Peace Corpsmen, Vista and civil rights workers, MAT's who are dissatisfied with their training, and experienced teachers (not many of these). The recruitment mechanisms are: word-of-mouth; brochures, magazine and newspaper articles; schools of education; and contacts.

Rewards: The rewards include a training stipend (\$75 a week); "personal reinforcement"; involvement in through "strength training" and expensive to educational and community change; opportunity to join the corporation as a member.

Placed after training: After the summer session training period some trainees go into the local district's schools; others leave to find jobs in other districts; some do not enter teaching. There are no exact figures available; Teachers, Inc. has no way to induct trainees into the system except by the normal certification route.

Best training experience: The training tasks can be accomplished. trainees do gain strength for teaching; the community does benefit.

Least adequate experience: The community agency work was poorly planned and articulated. Training objectives with agency placement were unclear. There was inadequate follow-through and incomplete recognition that merely placing some trainees in agencies would equal training.

This reporter believes that the group's own evaluation of its work was extremely honest and will repeat two of Roger Landrum's own published recommendations for this summer's training:

"Orientation of the trainees to the existential dimension of the training program, including clear statements about the family live-in, the agency work, and the general immersion into the fabric and chaos of the low-income community and the struggle of these people to make the institutions accountable to them.

More expertise in 'alternative' teaching methods, and curriculum to the methods trainees are familiar with, and also to clear-cut methods of teaching reading, math, and some form of social studies.

Less intensive schedules, including more planned recreational activities, including a retreat in the middle of the program and at the end. One of the two retreats should be a strenuous physical challenge, on the Outward Bound model, such as climbing a mountain or an overnight canoe trip on a river.

"Better coordination of seminar goals and procedures."

The costs were hard to arrive at. The reporter was given a budget figure of \$120,000 and a trainee population of 50, so a very rough estimate for 10 months training is \$2,400 per trainee, but this could be low when other costs are examined (agency and community time grants, etc.).

This organization is a one-man operation, although many people are involved. Roger Landrum, the Director, is the key figure. Also, the local district is an experimental one, with the established schools caught between the organized pressures of community control groups, a weakened central (and formerly projective bureaucracy). Thus, Teachers, Inc. can maneuver between parents, principals, and central bureaucracy to gain a foothold. In addition, the connection to Wofford and Dwight Allen has made possible an extraordinary respectability which provides significant clout with funding agencies (USOE; foundations). It is worth noting that similar projects spun off from this one were operated in Chapel Hill, N. C., during July-August, 1969.

This training facility is unique. It can be exported, however, wherever strongly motivated social action types with devoted leadership (such as exerted by Landrum) can be found. Where can it be found? Peace Corps types; social action and civil liberties groups; ex-ministerial students; but not in the same form or structure; and surely not institutionalized. The particular components worth studying and available during 1970-71 would be (1) the summer training materials, processes, and devices, and (2) the assessment of experiences by the trainees themselves. Landrum agreed to make materials now being developed available to us. The materials associated with Teachers, Inc. will be available at little or no cost.

Landrum and Genser were open, above-board, and direct, noticeably curious that an establishment type should be seeking out their opinions and experiences.

PERSONAL REACTION:

The Teachers, Inc. is an exciting community-based training institution. It probably conceives of itself less a training center and more a locus for radical interventions into the lives of children, parents, and teachers. It is problem oriented and honestly searches for solutions based upon a commitment to the teacher as a social change agent as well as an instructional leader.

In a very peculiar way, Teachers, Inc. may be able to develop interactional processes useful to teachers (working with parents, involvement in the culture of neighborhoods; communicating with pupils; opening the self-contained classroom to relevant others). If it can collate, sift, and refine its now amorphous but well-intentioned aspirations, it may be able, in fact, to become an important

contributor to the training complex yet to be invented which would want to prepare teachers of the urban poor.

It is too early to tell if Teachers, Inc. has made any real impact on the regular training of teachers. I believe its very substantial value is evident--that in preparing middle class white liberal arts graduates by the total immersion summer residence in the training locale of the inner city for their entry into slum school teaching, Teachers, Inc. is accomplishing more than a dozen "urban education" programs.

On the other hand, I believe the total immersion concept--the community as a teacher of teachers--should have been more thoroughly examined and the salient training components sorted out before the program got started. As it is now, too much depends upon interchange of community and teacher trainee leading to behavioral competence on the trainee's part. Merely living with a family does not lead to teaching skills or empathetic handling of learners.

MORTIMER KREUTER
(STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
AT STONY BROOK)

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO TEACHER TRAINING PROJECT

Dr. Henrietta Schwartz

The program is administered by an Executive Committee made up of University of Chicago faculty and representatives of the Chicago Board of Education. The full-time Director holds a principal's certificate with the Chicago Public Schools and has been Assistant Principal of an inner-city school in Chicago.

Basically, the project consists of a group of cadres each made up of 10 internes preparing for work in the Chicago schools, and a group of school personnel from a given school in which the cadre operates. The program has started with cadres in three high schools and one elementary school. It will expand to other schools as fast as experience indicates and finances permit.

There is a written agreement between the University of Chicago and the Chicago Board of Education which defines the ground rules for the project. In a given school where a cadre operates, the principal of the school is in charge and will interpret school policy and make decisions. It is expected that the administrative staff of the Chicago school system will ask for advice, both on the recruiting and training of their teachers and on the conduct of an educational program in the inner city schools.

The project has grown out of the interest of staff members of the Midwest Administration Institute of the University of Chicago. Under the leadership of Professor Roald Campbell, Luvern Cunningham, and others, the Midwest Center has been seeking ways of working with urban school systems.

The formal objectives are:

1. To train a group of graduate students for teaching and other jobs in inner city schools through a professional group or cadre within a school;
2. To develop model programs which can be disseminated;
3. To analyze existing programs, curricula, and teaching materials through the cadres so as to improve the educational program;
4. To study this process and evaluate it.

The program has tended to focus on secondary schools because the University of Chicago works largely with graduate students who are interested in secondary school teaching. However, there will be as much emphasis on elementary schools as is practicable.

The program commences with a six-week summer session containing the following components: (1) a cross-role seminar; (2) practice of new teaching methods; (3) study of Afro-American history and culture; (4) a curriculum seminar.

There is no effort to develop a large quantity of printed or mimeographed material. After the summer program, the trainees have a year of internship working within a cadre. The cross-role seminar carries on throughout the academic year and is aimed at helping the trainee understand the various roles that make up the social system of an urban school.

The trainers are faculty members of the school with some help from a small staff of the project.

Trainees are graduate students with a bachelor's degree who are taking part in a two-year program for the Master of Arts in teaching or the Master of Science in teaching degrees. There are also a few trainees who are preparing to become school social workers or school psychologists. Many of these people receive training stipends during their first year and are paid as interns during the second year. Upon completion of the program, the interns will be placed in the Chicago schools, and it is expected that they will work in inner city schools. The group of trainees is integrated racially.

There are 30 trainees, full time, who are matched with 30 experienced teachers. In addition, there is a small central staff of 4 or 5 people who work with the project. The training starts with a summer session and continues through the following academic year with a full-time internship.

Trainees are trained in high schools and elementary schools of the Chicago Public School System. Each trainee is part of a cadre of 10 trainees and 10 experienced teachers working under the general supervision of the school principal and of coordinators from the University of Chicago.

There is an evaluation and research staff which is evaluating the project in four areas:

1. The study of the background and characteristics of trainees. It is thought that this will be useful in developing a program of recruiting and selection of teachers for urban schools.
2. Each cadre of 20 persons is studied as a social system through interviews with all cadre members.
3. Impact of the cadre on the school:

- a. Impact on students. This will be evaluated largely through testing of students, and through observation and interviews with them.
 - b. Impact in the community and especially on parents. This will be studied largely through observation by the research staff.
 - c. Impact of the instructional program on the school. A record will be kept of curriculum development in the school with an attempt to relate curriculum changes to the training program.
4. Impact of the cadre on the university training program. Since university faculty serve as field supervisors (analogous to supervisors of practice teaching), a study is being made of the influence of this experience on the behavior and attitudes of the supervisors. Also, two new training programs have resulted from this project and are being evaluated. One is a Master of Science in teaching program at the secondary level for inner city school teachers. The other is a M.A. program for Urban Reading Consultants.

The trainees are being followed up during their first full-time placement year--their first year in full-time teaching after the training period. All of the first group of trainees have accepted employment in the school where they served as interns.

The best training experience, in the judgment of Dr. Schwartz, is the grounding of the training in the reality of the inner city school. Also, the University supervisory faculty members have become much more interested in the task of supervision of practice teachers.

The principal side effect is a vastly improved relationship of the University of Chicago with the Board of Education. The school system feels that the University is really interested in serving the school system. Another side effect is that the experienced teachers are learning a number of new techniques--such as micro-teaching, even though the project is not aimed at in-service training.

There is a problem due to the disappointment of the project staff at the slowness of change in the schools where they are working. One reason for this is the irregular attendance of pupils which interferes with lesson and unit planning. Attendance is somewhat below 70 per cent. Consequently, the teachers cannot plan on continuity from one class meeting to the next. Therefore, they have to

develop teaching plans which can be carried through in a single period. Thus, it is not possible to give them much training in the planning and implementation of a teaching unit.

A second problem is that of incorporating parents into the activity of the cadre.

A third problem is the general resistance of Negro students and parents to any kind of evaluation which involves testing. The parents want very much to do self-evaluation, and are quite willing to work with the teachers on a program of self-evaluation. However, they do not want any data collected which can compare their school with any other school.

The cost per trainee for the two-year period is something like \$7,000 per trainee each year. This includes the cost of tuition at the University of Chicago, the cost of the subsistence stipend which the trainees receive, and also the cost of the extra staff for the research project. Dr. Schwartz estimates that this kind of project could be carried on at a cost of \$2,000 per trainee per year in a public institution with low tuition. There would need to be a small supplementary staff beyond the present teacher training staff of the University. If no stipends were paid to the trainees and if the cost of the education was born largely by the state, then the cost of this kind of training program would be something like \$2,000 per trainee per year. The experienced teachers who are cadre members are paid for several hours' work a week, in addition to their regular salary.

Special cases, or contingencies, are few but the one example which comes to mind is that of a PTA president who is also a minister and a member of the Community Council. He has worked vigorously in a particular elementary school to promote action relationships between the training program and the parents. This is striking because it is so difficult to get this kind of activity in the average school.

This is not a unique program although it is being pioneered at the University of Chicago. It will be expanded at the rate of two or three schools a year for the next two or three years. It can easily be replicated in other cities. At present there are two cities where the school system and the local university are interested in replicating this program.

ROBERT J. HAVIGHURST
(UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO)

AD HOC NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRAINING COMPLEXES

Benjamin Bernstein
Principal
North High School

Eli M. Bower
School of Education
University of California

Francis L. Broderick
Chancellor
University of Massachusetts

Harold L. Cohen
Executive Director
Institute for Behavioral Research

Saul B. Cohen
Dean of the Graduate School
Clark University

Paul W. DeVore
Professor of Education
West Virginia University

Richard B. Ford
Assistant Professor of History
Clark University

Arthur L. Harris
Consultant-Expert
U.S.O.E.

Vernon Haubrich
School of Education
University of Wisconsin

Robert J. Havighurst
Professor of Education
University of Chicago

Mortimer Kreuter
Director of Teacher Preparation
State University of New York
at Stony Brook

William C. Kvaraceus
Chairman
Department of Education
Clark University

Mitchell P. Lichtenberg
Director
Training Complex Project

Irving A. Schwartz
Assistant Professor of Education
& Clinical Instructor
Clark University

Eugene E. Slaughter
Coordinator
Oklahoma-Texas TTT Project
Southeastern Oklahoma
State College

B. Othanel Smith
Professor of Educational
Philosophy
University of Illinois

Robert E. Stake
Associate Director (CIRCE)
University of Illinois

Herbert W. Wey
President
Appalachian State University

Donald R. Tuttle
U.S.O.E. Monitor

ACCEPTED MEMBERSHIP INVITATION
BUT UNABLE TO PARTICIPATE ACTIVELY

Charles E. Brown
Program Officer
Ford Foundation

John Davis
Superintendent of Schools
Minneapolis Public Schools

Edyth Gaines
District Superintendent
School District 12
New York City

<u>IN OPERATION SINCE</u>	<u>FUELING</u>	<u>PROTOCOLS IN</u>		
		<u>SUPPORT</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>DEVELOPMENT</u> <u>AVAILABLE</u>
Sears Roebuck Territorial Training Center	1965	Private	Own	Yes N/A
Institute for Behavioral Research, Inc.	1960	Private Non-profit	Varies	Yes Yes
Washington School Project (Illinois)	1968	Public	NSF Schools University	Not planned
Multi-Instructional Teacher Preparation Agency (Vermont)	1968	Public	EPDA	None to date Yes
National Training Laboratory for Applied Behavioral Science	1947	Private Non-profit	Tuition Foundations Government	Yes Yes
Metro-Atlanta Student Teaching Model	1969	Public	Government Schools University	None to date Yes
Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program	1966	Both	Fees Foundations Government	None to date Yes
Smoky Mountain Cultural Arts Development Association	1968	Public	ESEA III	Yes Yes
The EPD Consortium E (Texas)	1968	Public	EPDA	None to date Yes

	<u>IN</u> <u>OPERATION</u> <u>SINCE</u>	<u>FUNDING</u>		<u>PROTOCOLS</u> <u>IN</u>	
		<u>SUPPORT</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>DEVELOPMENT</u>	<u>AVAILABLE</u>
Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development	1966	Both	Government Foundations	Yes	Yes
Milwaukee Project (Early Childhood Training	1966	Public	Government	Yes	Yes
City University of New York Doctoral Program in Edu- cational Administration	1970	Public	University Fees	None as yet	Yes
The Teachers, Inc.	1968	Both	Foundations Government	Yes	Yes
The University of Chicago Teacher Training Project	1966	Both	Foundations Government	No	

TRAINING COMPLEX INVENTORY FORM

INVENTORY--TRAINING COMPLEX Investigator _____

Date of Visit _____

Name of Chief Respondent _____

Name of Organization _____

Public or Private _____ In Operation Since _____

Source of Funds _____

Organizational Structures (Give a brief chart plus description. include governing boards, central staff, outside groups, target populations, where responsibility lies, show numbers and/or ratios)

What are the typical contractual arrangements? (With other institutions, individuals, etc.)

How did the training center get started? (Give brief history, include interested groups at inception, who initiated what, who was responsible for initial planning?)

What are the formal objectives of the Training Center? (as stated in writing or orally)

What are the subject matter constraints? (What particular content areas, types of training are emphasized at this center? What are future plans?)

What protocols, instructional procedures, tactics, media are used? (How is training material developed, has it been tested, what level of training is it suited for, can it be made available to other organizations?)

Trainers (What is the source, how recruited, how rewarded during training, how trained, how evaluated?)

Trainees (What is the source, how recruited, rewarded during training, placed after training, evaluated?)

Trainees (What is ratio to staff, number of full time or part time trainees, when does training take place, how long, etc.?)

TRAINING COMPLEX INVENTORY FORM

(continued)

Instructional and Community Setting (Where are trainees trained? Schools, laboratory schools, outside community institutions? If several places give ratios.)

How does the Center evaluate its work? (Inside or independent evaluation group, what instruments are used, what is follow-up for trainees?)

What is the respondent's judgment of best and least adequate training experiences provided?

What is respondent's judgment of side effects and spin-offs (Unintended and unanticipated results--best/worst?)

Costs (What is yearly budget devoted to training? What is this figure over the number of equivalent full year trainees per year?)

List special cases, contingencies, critical inputs, catalysts here. (Example a local historical association provides 30% of training space free of charge and awards a certificate to all history trainees who participate in the history part of the training program.) (Example the training center is dependent on one key man.)

Is this training center unique? (Could it be exported, can we duplicate the training center, what components of the training center could be replicated?)

How can others get protocol material? (free, cost of materials?)

What is your opinion of the respondent as a source of information?

What is your personal reaction?

HOLDINGS:

INSTITUTE FOR BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH, INC.

Attachment A--"In-Service Teacher Training in Contingency Management"--(3 pages)

Attachment B--"Highland Park Elementary School Project"--(7 pages)

"Educational Therapy: The Design of Learning Environments" by Harold L. Cohen (Research in Psychotherapy, Volume 3, 1968)--(33 pages)

"New Thinking for New Universities: 1--Behavioural Architecture" by Harold L. Cohen (Architectural Association Journal, London, England, June, 1964)--(6 pages)

"In Support of Human Behavior" by Harold L. Cohen (Art Education, Journal of the National Art Education Association, October, 1969)--(6 pages)

Organizational Structure Chart--(1 page)

MULTI INSTITUTIONAL TEACHER PREPARATION AGENCY

List of Participants--(2 pages)

Profile of Participants--(2 pages)

Application Blank--(1 page)

"In Montpelier: How It All Began" by Della Ellison--(97 pages)

"Vermont Design for Education"--Vermont Department of Education--(25 pages)

METRO-ATLANTA STUDENT TEACHING MODEL

Exhibit A--Metro-Atlanta Student Teaching Model Chart--(1 page)

Exhibit B--Metro-Atlanta Student Teaching Model Narrative--(5 pages)

Learning Resources Center for Improving Teacher Training--Final Report--Fiscal Year 1969--(78 pages)

HOLDINGS:

(continued)

FAR WEST LABORATORY FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

1969 Annual Report--(16 pages)

"1970 Revision of the Long-range Plan for the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development"--(75 pages)

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM

"Education for the Inner City: A Practical Proposal by an Impractical Theorist"--J. W. Getzels--(The School Review Vol. 75 , No. 3, Autumn 1967)--(17 pages)

The Ford Training and Placement Program--"A Program of Training and Placement of Professional Groups for Urban Schools"--(6 pages)

HOLDINGS:

(continued)

FAR WEST LABORATORY FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

1969 Annual Report--(16 pages)

"1970 Revision of the Long-range Plan for the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development"--(75 pages)

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM

"Education for the Inner City: A Practical Proposal by an Impractical Theorist"--J. W. Getzels--(The School Review--Vol. 75 , No. 3, Autumn 1967)---(17 pages)

The Ford Training and Placement Program--"A Program of Training and Placement of Professional Groups for Urban Schools"--(6 pages)